DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 236 704 CS 504 242

AUTHOR Kougl, Kathleen M.
TITLE A Selected Review of Speech Communication Studies in the Arts: A Retrospective and Prospective Look.
PUB DATE Apr 83
NOTE 49p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Eastern Communication Association (Ocean City, MD, April 27-30, 1983).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Information Analyses (070) -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Communication Research; Literature Reviews; *Oral Interpretation; Professional Associations; *Research Methodology; *Research Needs; Research Problems; *Speech Communication; *Theater Arts

ABSTRACT

Analysis of speech communication studies reveals a number of themes in the arts. A central concern in studies dealing with oral interpretation is what should be the focus in the oral interpretive act. The shifting priorities parallel the shift in emphases occurring in speech communication as a whole: performer/delivery; text/message; listener/audience; and interactive. In the theatre studies, there is a corresponding dialogue on the purpose of educational theatre programs and the value of theatre for society. Research and scholarly themes cluster around historical studies, current practices, analyses of texts, and performer/audience studies. The final theme in the communication studies, self-evaluation, is found only in the oral interpretation studies, implying perhaps a satisfaction with the directions for future studies. Oral interpretation scholars need to do more empirical and experimental research, while theatre scholars should examine the interface between speech communication and professional theatre organizations. Obstacles to overcome include problems with research methodology and communication within the field. (HOD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED236704

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

A Selected Review of Speech Communication Studies in the Arts: A Retrospective and Prospective Look

Kathleen M. Kougl
Youngstown State University
Department of Speech Communication and Theatre

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Kathleen M. Kougl

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Paper presented at the Eastern Communication Association Convention, Ocean City, Maryland, April, 1983

CS 504242

I realize the presence of the arts on a panel addressing communication studies in significant areas of the social sciences at a convention whose theme is "Communication in a Complex Social Reality" may seem anomalous. In our pragmatic troubled age beset by economic woes, rapidly changing technology, shrinking markets for formerly valued skills, threat of nuclear holocaust, the arts may seem a pleasant but effete luxury for the privileged few. For many, the arts have come to mean the fine and performing arts--arts, music, theatre, and dance--whose purpose is the professional development of the few for the greater entertainment of the many. But no matter how parochial definition of the arts may become for some, nor how far speech communication drifts towards the behavioral sciences, their common base is the liberal arts. It seems fitting, then, that I begin by reaffirming what instruction in the liberal arts provides.

In a 1977 symposium on higher education and speech communication, Wallace Bacon said the purpose of education is to enable us to become sensitive and responsive human beings. He cautioned us to recall we come from a humanistic discipline which means our concern is with how to be a human being, not just how to act like a human being. In a 1976 symposium on speech and the humanities, he saw instruction in the humanities as educating people in this broad sense, "The refining and civilizing and freeing of the human spirit" (p. 136).

An appreciation of what the liberal arts could mean is provided by the ancient Greek culture. According to Gilbert Highet in The Classical Tradition, the Greeks are still alive and working through us because they realized that to be fully human meant to live the good life of the mind. As Highet (1959) explains the Greek view:

> Civilization means education--not only for children but for men and women throughout their lives. One of the most varied and interesting methods of education is literature. Greece knew that dramas and songs, tales and histories, are not only amusements for a moment but, because of their continuously fertile content, permanent possessions for the mind. (pp. 547-548)

Turning to poetic experiences for a moment, they traditionally have been viewed as providing pleasure or catharsis, but they are also a vehicle to a special way of knowing (Geiger, 1973; Walsh, 1969). Dorothy Walsh, who in Literature and Knowledge (1969) addresses the question of what kind of knowledge, if any, does literary art afford, says we only learn from our experience to the degree we are able to reflect upon it and realize its meaning. Too often, however, daily living produces such a myriad of ephemeral impressions that we are only able to grasp its significance in a fleeting, fragmentary way. The literary artist, on the other hand, who seeks to realize meaning in a fuller way,

uses the meanings gained, shaping and elaborating them into the literary work. The work achieves a public and a permanent presence, which means it is available to be shared and to be contemplated, thus allowing us to participate in its insights. The structured and articulate literary work enables us to apprehend the possible meanings in experience in a way that day to day experience does not. "Were it not for the testimony of the literary artist, ... [we] would never suppose, dream or imagine that the kind of complicated material that finds expression in literature was ever available for realization." (Walsh, 1969, p. 107)

The rich potential of poetic experiences can be shared through performance. When it comes to the arts it is the poetic triumvirate of literature, theatre, and oral interpretation--liberal and performing arts all--that the field of speech communication has been concerned with as revealed in our journals [1] Their separate boundaries merge in our discipline because theatre and oral interpretation perform literary texts. Together these arts provide a process through which each of us may come to new understandings about self, others, and what it means to be fully human. To borrow the more colloquial words of Saul Bellow, "Everybody's human only in some degree .... It's not a natural gift at all. Only the capactiy is natural" (1971, p. 277). The capactiy has always needed developing, and the liberal arts have provided a means to do so. In our complex social

reality we need to heed the humanizing message of the arts more than ever.

Returning to today's theme, this panel's point of view is Janus-like with one face directed to what has been done in the past and the other face looking forward into the future for what needs to be done. Using this motif as my organizer, I would like to begin by explaining what themes emerged in the analysis of studies done in the past, then discuss possible directions for future research, and end with noting what obstacles need to be overcome.

Themes in Communication Studies in the Arts

Self-Definition

The most striking theme in the studies dealing with oral interpretation is one of definition of what should be the focus in the oral interpretive act. The performance of the literature is always central in this dialogue, but there is a difference of opinion about what is the most important element in the process of performing the literature. These shifting priorities parallel the shift in emphases occurring in speech communication as a whole: performer/delivery; text/message; listener/audience; interactive.

In the sixties the shift from the initial performer-centered emphasis to text-centered emphasis was well under

way with only remnants of the earlier delivery emphasis remaining. Geiger (1962) stated the previous decade had witnessed a turning away from the delivery emphasis inspired by the example of the New Critics' close textual analysis. Hargis (1960) reminded the reader that the vocal-physical elements should not be forgotten in the total process of interpretation. Post (1963) emphasized textual analysis, yet reminded the reader to practice "bodily action exercises." Wallace Bacon, in his famous, "The Dangerous Shores: From Elocution to Interpretation," (1960) spoke of the danger in dichotomizing text and delivery. He felt the tide was turning in the direction of the text, but attention to text and delivery were needed because meaning was not something abstracted from structure, rather it was only felt and understood within the structure. This note of the importance of performing the text in order to achieve the fullest understanding of it was also sounded by Geiger (1962) and Beloof (1969).

The next shift occurred during the late sixties when articles began appearing that focused on communicating to the audience and rhetorical critics started taking an interest in literature. Sloan (1967) proposed synthesizing the New Critics' intrinsic analysis and the rhetorical extrinsic analysis. He said the rhetorical critics saw the role of oral delivery to be one of clarification of, "the implied author's style in order to elicit the audience's response to

the ethos of the work" (p. 96). Macksoud (1968) stated the oral interpreter's function was rhetorical, "relating the work to particular people and they to the work" (p. 71). Commenting on the activity of the sixties, Bacon (1972) recognized the increased interest in the audience but felt the rhetorical view was not productive because imaginative literature sought immediate, not mediate, use. For him interpretation was an act of performance with the reader trying to achieve congruence with the text. He felt bringing the audience into that match was a subsequent problem.

In the seventies the emphasis shifted to an interactive one. The focus was on describing how performance fit into the interaction of audience, text, and performer. In a sense oral interpretation had come full circle, entering into a stage where all the separate elements that had received attention over the years were integrated into a greatly expanded concept of performance. Sharpham, Matter, and Brockreide (1971) defined the interpretive experience as a rhetorical transaction involving the interaction of the literary work, the interpreter, and the auditor. Several people explained performance as a twofold experience--a process of coming to understand the work and as a process or demonstrating that understanding (Espinola, 1977; Geiger, 1972; Hudson, 1973). Criticizing earlier narrower definitions of performance, Campbell (1971) included all parties to the performance as participants in it and

proposed "communication aesthetics" as a more accurate labeling of the process than the phrase oral interpretation of literature. Gray (1979) thought focusing on any single element of the oral interpretative process produced untenable positions, and proposed "communication" as the term that accounted for all perceivable elements.

In the theatre studies there was a corresponding dialogue questioning the purpose of educational theatre programs and the value of theatre for the society. Hobbes (1964) preferred small liberal arts preparation for people seeking careers in professional theatre and made suggestions how such programs could compete with university training. Becker (1966) felt theatre was necessary for society because of the insights, pleasure, and humanizing influence it provided. For Lazier (1970) the ultimate goal of theatre pedagogy was to increase skill, understanding, and pleasure from theatrical experiences. Clark (1971) said the failure to distinguish liberal arts training from professional training had to be overcome if theatre programs were to matter or even survive. This confusion in priorities and methods resulted in a failure to raise standards of dramatic art or even to create a demand for it. "Where can we find the zeal of music educators who have totally convinced the right people that ... every child needs music?" (Clark, p. 30) Brockett (1976) assessed theatre as existing on the "outer edges of respectability" because programs were too

often "watered down professional training" even though the majority of programs were in liberal arts colleges. His solution was to reunite all elements of theatre study now housed separately in English, speech and theatre departments, so theatre could return to its rightful place as a humanistic study. Gillespie (1979) thought theatre, and speech communication as well, should cease focusing on artifacts preceding or following the ongoing process (i.e. performing a play, giving a speech) and concentrate on the event itself with its prevailing assumptions about mankind.

Research

There was a cluster of similar research and scholarship themes in the theatre and oral interpretation studies. These themes were historical studies, current practices, analyses of texts, and performer/audience studies.

Historical studies. The historical studies for theatre and oral interpretation followed similar methods. The most frequently used method was a straight descriptive account. The second most used method was a descriptive-analytic one, which usually focused on the subject's significance to some later development. The theatre studies differed from the oral interpretation studies in several ways. They surpassed them in number, variety of subjects covered, and the wider coverage in terms of historical periods and countries represented. There was also a noticeable difference in that the regional journals reporting regional developments in theatre

but not in oral interpretation.

The interpretation studies were few in number and dealt primarily with the transitional period in America from elocution to oral interpretation. The usual focus was on the contribution of a significant leader, such as Charles Woolbert (Barclay, 1972), followed by studies dealing with broader aspects of elocution (Mattingly, 1964; Reynolds, 1961; Rickert, 1978). Apart from this emphasis, there were only a few studies which dealt with other topics such as the ancient Greek oral traditions (Enos, 1978; Hargis, 1970) or what the Irish had done to preserve their oral traditions (Breneman & Breneman, 1965).

The great number and diversity in subject of the theatre studies divided themselves on the basis of the breath or specificity of coverage as the following representative titles indicate. Some articles dealt with an aspect of theatre art over an extended period of time, such as a type of drama, "The Theatre of Ideology in Nazi Germany" (Zortmann, 1971), a theme, "The Antibusiness Theme in Late 19th Century American Drama" (Gottlieb, 1978), a theatre, "Baltimore's 18th Century French Theatre" (Ritchey, 1972), or an acting technique, "Death on the Romantic Stage" (Woodbury, 1963). Other articles dwelt on narrower aspects of theatre, such as a manager, "John T. Ford and the Savannah Theatre" (Overstreet, 1972), a performer, "Charles Kean: Tragedian in Transition" (Wilson, 1974), a scenic

convention, "America's First Revolving Stage" (Cole, 1963), or a designer, "Clarkson Standfield, R.A.: Scene Painter, Artist, Gentleman and Friend" (Bogusch, 1970).

Current practices. The studies dealing with current practices differed in methodologies with the oral interpretation studies being descriptive or applied, while the theatre studies were more analytical. There was also a wider variety of subjects for the theatre studies.

The oral interpretation studies dealt primarily with Readers Theatre. In subject they ranged from a period of definition in the early sixties, to a time of borrowing ideas from other fields to solve production problems in the late sixties, and continued through to a period of experimentation in staging and scripting in the seventies. The early definitional articles usually dwelt on how Readers Theatre differed from conventional theatre (Coger, 1963), and some also traced its roots back to ancient oral practices (Brooks, Henderhan & Billings, 1963; Coger, 1963). At this time the dichotimization of presentational styles was emphasized: theatre (realistic, acting) vs. Readers Theatre (illustionistic, suggestive). Agreement on the boundaries of Readers Theatre led to application of ideas from other areas and a subsequent greater flexibility about the form. Borrowed ideas came from perception theory (Kleinau & Kleinau, 1966), nonverbal communication (Coger & Pelham, 1975; Hirschfeld-Medalia, 1976), and theatre (Abel & Post,

1973; Reitz, 1966). Schneider's description of metaphoric staging (1976) and Reinstra's proposal for using historical documents (1972) are examples of the kind of experimenting going on.

The borrowing of ideas evidenced in the Readers Theatre studies also characterized the field as a whole. Suggested applications to oral interpretation in general came from such sources as social cognition research (Pelias, 1982), linguistics (Scott, 1977), folklore (Speer, 1975), and sociolinguistics-literary criticism-folklore (Fine & Speer, 1977).

The theatre studies dealt with professional theatre interests, usually the New York theatre. Although there were not as many articles as there had been with the historical research theme, the subjects did cover a wide range: presenting an alternative interpretation for a modern production of a period play (Scully, 1966); analyzing Method acting against Stanislavski's theories (Glenn, 1963); developing a theatrical counterpart for the pentad (Kirk, 1968); analyzing emergent themes in current dramatic writing (Jackson, 1961); London's subsidized theatres (Loney, 1966); and, integrated casting (Harrison, 1969). Also, Alan Downer presented annual criticism of the New York theatre from 1960-1969.

Analysis of texts. A large number of the studies for oral interpretation and theatre fall within the textual

studies theme. If one divides these studies according to their intended performance medium--theatre (dramatic literature) or oral interpretation (all other types of literature) --four striking differences emerge in the implications of the studies for performance, the nature of the texts studied, the subjects of the studies, and the critical tools used.

The relationship of the study to performance was more direct for the oral interpretation studies than for the theatre studies. In the interpretation studies the purpose was either explicitly stated or obvious from the content to be one of assistance to the performer in determining the best reading. In the theatre studies, however, issues of performance were rarely addressed in any fashion, although it is to be assumed that the ultimate reason for analyzing a play or a playwright's work is to aid in the making of production decisions.

The next difference was the nature of the texts studied. In the theatre studies the text was always a play, although it might be a single play, a series of plays by one playwright, or a comparison of plays by different playwrights. In the oral interpretation studies, however, there were few specific texts studied. Most of the articles dealt with how to handle some aspect of a genre, whether poetry, nonfiction prose or drama. The largest number of studies was on poetry, followed by in descending order of frequency, nonfiction prose and drama. The tenor of these application

articles becomes clear from sample titles. Examples include the following: "A Function of Metaphor in Poetry" (Brown, 1973) for poetry, "The Nature, Function, and Performance of Indirect Discourse in Prose Fiction" (Espinola, 1974) for nonfiction prose, and "Problems in the Interpretation of Shakespeare" (Bacon, 1973) for drama.

The third difference involved the subject of the studies. The theatre studies revealed a variety of playwrights' work, including both traditional notables, such as O'Neill, Ibsen, and Brecht, and newer playwrights who reflected dramaturgical developments such as the Theatre of the Absurd in the sixties (Genet, Albee, Ionesco) and the New Theatre in the seventies (Pinter, Wesker, Kopit). In the oral interpretation studies dealing with a specific text, the subject was usually a well known poet, such as Auden, Dylan Thomas or Roethke. Newer poets were not represented, although a newer form of poetry was--concrete poetry (McHughes, 1977; Merritt, 1969).

The final difference was the critical tools used. In the theatre studies these tools were varied and were used to reap a fuller understanding of a play or series of plays by a playwright or to put forth some alternative interpretation of a play. The critical concepts utilized were borrowed from such diverse sources as philosophy (Matherne, 1978), linguistic analysis (Adler, 1975), cognitive dissonance theory (Post, 1969), kinesics (Murphy, 1972), dramatic structure (Kaufman, 1972), literary criticism (Thurman,

1966), and communication analysis (Hellweg & Hellweg, 1982).

The critical tools used in the oral interpretation research were not as vaired as they were in the theatre studies. The two most frequently used methods of analysis for both the application articles and the articles dealing with specific texts were the linguistic (Hopkins, 1969, 1971) and the related structural approach (Lee, 1963; Hopkins, 1977). Less frequently used was literary analysis on the verbal or thematic level, but it, too, was represented both in the application (McCurdy, 1966) and the specific text articles (Paden, 1975).

Beginning in the late sixties rhetorical analysis became another critical tool used in both oral interpretation and theatre textual research. This development was presaged throughout the sixties by articles seeking to clarify the relationship between rhetoric and poetic, particularly emphasizing their similarities (Erlich, 1973; Kaufman, 1967; Molette, 1968; Staub, 1961). These articles argued that rhetoric and poetic differed in degree and circumstance, not in kind, since both dealt with persuasion: rhetoric in the particular case; poetic in the universal case. Both arts tried to persuade an audience that the character and thought were credible. Given this current of thought, it was not surprising that rhetorical analysis should be applied to the rhetoric within the literary work. Examples are, "The Shropshire Lad as

Funeral Orator" (Browne, 1971) for poetry, and "Rhetoric in Action: Orators in the Plays of Henrik Ibsen" (Waal, 1971) for drama. Articles explaining this internal rhetorical approach appeared for drama (Maher, 1975) and other types of literary works (Salper, 1973).

Rhetorical analysis was also applied to external rhetoric, wherein the author's message was directed deliberately to the audience member or reader of the work. This method of examining the rhetoric of the work rather than in the work was applied to a variety of forms, such as autobiography (Benson, 1974), fictional prose (Downey & Kallan, 1982), and drama (Macksoud & Altman, 1971). In the case of drama, critics consideration of external rhetoric sometimes went beyond an individual play to groups of plays that expressed the socio-political aspirations of a group, as with Black Theatre (Riach, 1970) and Feminist Theatre (Gillespie, 1978).

Performer/audience studies. The final research theme, performer/audience, includes studies whose methodologies differ markedly from the previously considered studies in their use of an empirical or experimental method. The theatre and oral interpretation studies using these methods dealt with three main issues: developing semantic differentials for theatre and Readers Theatre to measure meaning or changes in meaning for performers and audience in response to some kind of dramatic experience (Brooks & Crane, 1974;

Brandsen, Rockey & Kleinau, 1965; Hansen & Bormann, 1969; Smith, 1961; Thayer, 1964; Witt, 1966); the interaction of the performer with the text (Kaplan & Mohrmann, 1977; Mohrmann & Kaplan, 1980) or with the audience (Williams & Alexander, 1973); and, audience responses. The issue of audience responses generated the most studies. These studies tried to quantify audience responses to a number of production elements, such as shifts in attitude (Hansen, Phillips & Arnold, 1965; Michielutte, 1969; Phillips, Hansen & Carlson, 1965), a staging technique (Dolan, 1971; Gamble, 1977; Sturges, 1975), different formats of presentation (Brooks & Wulfetange, 1964; Warland, Trauernicht & Gruner, 1967), and dramatic structure (Lazier, Zahn & Bellinghiere, 1974). Other studies using empirical or experimental methods raised questions about personality differences between effective and ineffective actors (Klinzing, 1973), correlates of aesthetic interest for secondary students (Loveland & Michielutte, 1973), and developmental differences in improvisational behavior (Lazier, Sutton-Smith & Zahn, 1971). The exception to the use of the empirical or experimental approach in dealing with performer/audience questions was a series of articles, a debate, on the issue of whether the audience's role was an abstract one or one of active participant in the theatrical performance (Campbell, 1981a, 1981b; Gillespie, 1981).

Self-Evaluation

The final theme in the communication studies in the arts is one of self-evaluation. It is found only in the oral interpretation studies, implying perhaps a satisfaction with the direction of theatrical research. Articles periodically appeared evaluating the state of the oral interpretative art and suggesting needed research directions. These articles sounded strikingly similar notes. They called for more research and questioned the borrowing of concepts from other fields. They called for exploration of the oral tradition and for application of oral interpretation in a broader social context.

Calls for more research usually mentioned the need for historical research and for the increased use of empirical and experimental methodologies. Historical studies were needed to fill in the considerable gaps in the knowledge about the nature and practice of oral interpretation. Veilleux (1969) felt this lack of a complete historical account deprived the field of a firm tradition, thus contributing to a confusion in theory. Whitaker (1973) wanted these historical investigations to deal with literary performance, aesthetic and literary theories. In 1981, Hopkins and Long added the need to study our recent past, in particular current developments in teaching and curricula. Suggesting the need for more empirical and experimental research, Klyn (1965) said the field needed to stop treating

hypotheses as premises. As an example, he cited the need to define empirically and to measure the actual effects of oral interpretation on students. The participants in a 1969 symposium on experimental and empirical studies in oral interpretation concluded that the areas most productively approached with such methodologies were the performance of literature, and the relationships among the author, performer, and audience (Symposium, 1969). Whitaker (1973) supported the need for experimental research, particularly on the relationship between the performer and the text. Hopkins and Long (1981) said the refinement in research techniques should enable researchers to do needed studies on performer effects.

Comments on the issue of borrowing ideas from other disciplines seemed divided between those who saw it as a strength and as a reflection of the field's interdisciplinary nature and those who viewed it as a sign of weakness in the field or a circumstance to be regretted. Beloof (1969) said oral interpretation scholars were not doing the significant work in oral literature and were largely unacquainted with what was being done by scholars in folk literature, anthropology, linguistics, and psychology. Campbell (1971) felt oral interpretation had few if any concepts which had led to further important developments or had been perceived as sufficiently worthwhile to be borrowed by other disciplines. Whitaker (1973) said interdisciplinary preparation was needed in studying preliterate societies. Hopkins and

Long (1981) said someone would need to learn the theory from other disciplines in order to sift out what was relevant to the performance of literature. Bacon, who saw the borrowings as enhancing interpretation (1970, 1977), also saw the other side of the issue. He commented, "I wish that we were ourselves more often capable of developing insights. We too often simply explicate, illustrate, or apply the insights of others" (1977).

The call for exploration of the oral tradition in our society and in other societies is related to the issue of borrowing. For among the suggestions for a revival of the oral tradition (Beloof, 1969; Veilleux, 1969; Whitaker, 1973), there were people who saw other disciplines such as anthropology, folklore, and literary history (Thompson, 1973) and sociolinguistics, folklore, and literary criticism (Fine & Speer, 1977) as aiding in this endeavor. In 1981, Hopkins and Long also suggested study of writers performing their own work and of storytellers.

This expression of the need to study oral traditions in all their manifestations seems linked, in turn, to the final self-evaluative call for returning oral interpretation to a larger social context. Veilleux (1969) said oral interpretation, like all the arts, had a social contribution to make, "modern interpretation by returning literature to its social context helps to create a bridge between the inner world of fantasy experience and the outer world of

social reality" (p. 112), and thus holds a "therapeutic potential". In criticizing practices in literary studies, Beloof warned teachers not to view students as performers only, but rather as people sharing in a process of learning. This process of learning how to make the poetic sentient again could contribute to "the humanization of our education and our cultural life" (1969, p. 12).

Possible Directions for Future Research

The themes that emerge from reviewing communication studies in the arts suggest several promising directions for future research in historical and textual studies, oral traditions, effects, and current practices.

In the area of historical and textual studies, oral interpretation scholars need to do more of this kind of research, while theatre scholars should continue their present course. In fact, the amount and diversity of theatre studies on historical and textual themes could serve as a worthy model for oral interpretation scholars to emulate. Historical studies ranging across every element of dramatic production throughout Western theatre history have produced a rich tradition that supports current theatre practice as well as informs modern productions of period plays. The theatre studies focus only on dramatic texts, but they analyze them with a variety of critical tools borrowed, without apology, from many disciplines. These analyses

focus on the meaning of specific texts, whole texts, not parts of texts. Since there is this norm for doing specific text research, new playwrights are subject to study as they come along.

Oral interpretation studies, which currently produce few historical studies and a textual study focus on how to handle various genres, need to diversify. More historical studies are needed which connect twentieth century academic oral interpretation with historical oral traditions, so the considerable gap is filled in between knowledge of current practice and ancient Greek practices. In order for the field to develop a fuller sense of its own identity these studies need to examine aesthetic and literary theories, performance behaviors, accounts of what was performed, and explanations of how the traditions reflected their cultural context. A more complete historical account of this nature would contribute to a sense of tradition and perhaps lead to a clarification of theory.[2] More textual studies are needed that focus on a greater variety of texts, emphasize specific texts, and utilize more variety in choice of critical tools. The current textual studies emphasis on how to examine types of literature should be broadened to include analysis of specific texts. Fictional prose, drama, nonfictional prose, and nonliterary texts, in short, all the kinds of available texts should be subject to scholarly study. Within genres there should also be more daring displayed in the author

studied, extending both back into historic time and forward into the present. If a wider variety of genres and authors were studied, then other kinds of critical tools would need to be employed. For example, the study of the oral traditions of preliterate societies is expanding the concept of text to include oral texts, which may require borrowing from other disciplines for the methodology to create the texts and necessitate the creation of new critical tools for oral interpreters to examine such texts (Conquergood, 1982). Critical concepts and techniques from other disciplines could be used, as with theatre without apology, if they helped elicit meaning from the text.

Both theatre and oral interpretation textual studies need to clarify their relationship to performance, albeit in different ways. For theatre the analyses' implications for production should be stated. For oral interpretation there need to be accounts of what was learned about specific texts through performance. If oral interpretation includes both the process of discovering the meaning in a text and the process of demonstrating that meaning, as Espinola (1977), Geiger (1972), and Hudson (1973) suggested, then studies need to make the entire process clear. The few specific text studies analyze an aspect of the text and refer to how it would affect performance, thus giving the impression that oral interpretation is literary analysis that occurs before performance.

The second promising direction for future research lies in the continued study of oral traditions. The research into oral traditions that is being done is leading to expanded concepts of performer, text, and audience. Performers include not only the traditional performer in classroom or recital hall, but also the local storytellers, the interviewees in oral history projects (Speer & Fine, 1982), citizens of preliterate societies (Conquergood, 1982), inmates in correctional institutions (Valentine & Donovan, 1978) and reticent students (Hopf, 1970). Texts include not only the traditional literary ones, but also nonliterary texts created from the actual words of real people. The audience includes no longer just the traditional academic one. When nonliterary texts are returned in performance to people who must deal with their "authors", then representatives of governmental and social agencies (Conquergood, 1982) and ordinary citizens (Hartman & Alho, 1980) become audiences as well. New performers, texts, and audiences created by these expanding definitions need to be studied. This is only the beginning. As Janet Elsea expressed it, "until we realize that this art form of ours is also a powerful communication tool, and until we take it out of the womb of academia and give it birth in the 'real world'; interpretation programs will continue to whither away" (1978, pp. 30-31). Interpretation has moved into a broader social context, but it is still in its childhood.

Other disciplines' work in oral traditions has customarily been viewed as yielding information that aids interpreters in their understanding of performance in general. This element of extension outward into nonacademic areas may be the answer to those who regret oral interpretation's lack of significant contribution to other fields. For oral interpretation not only learns about performance from the work of anthropologists and folklorists, it can also contribute to these disciplines. It can provide these fields with an alternative way to understand the oral texts they study, and, more importantly perhaps, with a way to preserve the texts' orality by sharing them through performance (Fine & Speer, 1977).

All of these expanding ideas of performer, text, and audience are integrated in the concept of performing literature, thus leading to the next promising direction for research, effects. Studies are needed that focus on the effects of each of the elements of the total performance process--performer, text, audience--on each other. Both theatre and oral interpretation scholars need to study the short and long term effects of training in the process of doing performance, experience of viewing performance, and performer and audience attitudes about drama and literature. We all believe that theatrical and interpretative experiences have a positive effect on students. We have been moved by such experiences ourselves. Yet Klyn's comment that we

need to stop treating hypotheses as premises seems as valid now as when he made the statement in 1965. What exactly is it that we know? Is this knowledge demonstrable to others? Is the lack of demonstration of substantive effects partially responsible for Brockett's view of theatre as existing on the "outer edges of respectability"? Or Beloof's view of oral interpretation as less than a dynamic force in literary education? If we had more research demonstrating actual effects, perhaps we would be as successful as the music educators in convincing administrators and the general public that oral interpretation and theatre belong in the curriculum.

Preliminary studies that have been done in both theatre and oral interpretation on the interaction of the elements of performance have focused mainly on the effects of four factors on the audience: the message of the play; staging techniques; different modes of presentation; and, gender of performer. Any of these beginning studies could be used as a starting point for further study of the effects on the audience. But research also needs to be done on the effects of the performer--text interaction, and of the audience on the performer. What kind of attitude shifts occur in performers as a result of interacting with different messages in various literary genres? How are performer and audience attitudes changed as a result of experiencing texts from other cultural groups? (Speer, 1975) How do effects differ for people of differing literary, dramatic, or educational

backgrounds? It is important to remember that the expanded definitions of performer, text, and audience will further complicate the asking and answering of such questions; certainly, they greatly enlarge the setting and the circumstances where the questions need to be posed.[3] For example, if non-literary texts are performed for a rhetorical purpose, what are the effects? When the Laotian refugees' texts were performed for the Housing Authority, what, if any, were the changes in attitudes toward the refugees? (Conquergood, 1982) When scripts based on oral histories of elderly people (Hartman & Alho, 1977) and handicapped people (Hartman & Alho, 1979) were performed for ordinary citizens, how were attitudes changed? How were public policies subsequently changed?

The issue of effects leads to the final promising direction for research, current practices. One area needing systematic study is the nature of classroom practices for both oral interpretation and theatre. What is the nature of curricula and pedagogy on the secondary and college level? Is theatre training "watered down professional training"? (Brockett, 1976) Are oral interpretation courses training performers only? (Beloof, 1969) What theories and philosophies underlie the curricula? To what extent are aesthetic judgments and standards developed? What are the most effective methods with what kind of students? How do we know? Are programs growing or diminishing and why? To what extent

do English teachers use oral interpretation as a method of literary study? If they do not, why not?

Other areas of current practice that need further exploration exist for both fields. The experimentation with the Readers Theatre form should continue with imaginative scripting, staging, and application of ideas from other fields. In fact, borrowing from other fields should continue for the field as a whole. Any idea that aids in the understanding of a text, the nature of performance, or the relationships among elements of the interpretative process should be used. Chamber Theatre deserves greater exposure and experimentation. Are Chamber Theatre productions less frequent than Readers Theatre productions? If so, why? Have the two forms merged in terms of current production practice? The theatre studies should continue to update what is happening in dramaturgy and criticism, but they should be doing more research into these areas. While most studies deal with some aspect of professional New York theatre, researchers should also deal with regional and repertory theatre. Specific criticism of the New York theatre season should be reestablished as part of the speech communication journal offerings.

Obstacles

These promising directions for future study have several obstacles to overcome. Oral interpretation research needs to

solve problems with research methodology and communication within the field. Theatre researchers need to examine the problem of the interface between the American Theatre Association and the Speech Communication Association.

Despite acknowledgments that people in oral interpretation should be doing empirical and experimental research, there are few studies published in our journals that use such methodologies. The most popular type of article is textual, and the most frequent method is descriptive. There even seems to be agreement about the broad areas empirical and experimental methods could most productively be applied, the interactive effects of performer, text, and audience on one another. Why these methods are so little used needs to be answered. One way to arrive at an answer would be to survey graduate programs in oral interpretation to determine what kind of preparation in research methodologies is required. The field needs an updated survey following Whitaker's 1973 model in which she surveyed graduate professors in oral interpretation to determine current and anticipated research projects among other topics. It might prove that the field's reach exceeds its grasp because graduate programs are not training or otherwise encouraging students to do what is essentially nontraditional research. Oral interpretation scholars need to be encouraged to do cooperative research with people trained in quantitative methods (Hopkins & Long, 1981).

The second problem that oral interpretation scholars need to address is one of communication within the field. The exciting new trends, such as research into oral traditions and movement of the art into a wider social context, are little reported in the speech communication journals. Such trends are not reported frequently enough in our journals to be considered a theme in this review, although they are noted. Are editors' traditional attitudes about oral interpretation not reflecting what is current in the field? Are people doing research in these new areas submitting their studies to journals in other disciplines? One new journal, Literature in Performance, does bring together many of the kinds of research called for in the self-evaluative articles. This new journal offers more variety in texts studies, special features such as production records and performance reviews, and interviews with writers and performers. Whether or not this journal was created due to a lack of access to the regular speech journals is a moot point. It may become to oral interpretation people what Communication Education is to speech teachers. However, I still think it is important that the speech communication discipline as a whole be better informed about what is developing in oral interpretation. Perhaps this need could be filled by the regional journals, which already have served so ably as a forum for regional theatre studies. These journals could publish studies dealing with

new developments in oral interpretation in their region, such as projects in oral traditions and performances of nontraditional texts. To serve such an end perhaps these journals could borrow some of the special features from Literature in Performance and incorporate them into their format.

The issue for theatre is one of interface between the American Theatre Association and the Speech Communication Association. Quite clearly, the theatre studies published in our journals are primarily historical and textual. What kind of theatre studies are published in the theatre journals? What is the nature of the split in scholarly interests between the two disciplines? Would we find that the speech journals get the verbally-oriented studies, while the theatre journals get the production-oriented studies? It is important to clarify the nature of the division of past interests because it indicates the likely direction of future research.

I began with an affirmation of the value of the arts, and I end with it. Several authors commented it was the dawn of the print age that deafened people's ears to the oral nature of literature (Beloof, 1969; Sloan, 1971). If that is the case, perhaps we should consider how much our increasingly visual, nonliterate age needs the return of the oral performance of literature and the spectacle of theatre. David Elkind in his recent book, The Hurried Child--Growing Up Too Fast Too Soon, (1982) explains the tremendous price being exacted from our children by societal pressures which force

them to act like grown-ups. He offers the arts as a way for children to handle this great burden of stress. "Far from being a luxury, time and money spent on the arts enhances learning and development by reducing the stress of hurrying and by giving children an aesthetic perspective to balance the workday one" (p. 197). Our children need the arts and so do we. If they are to become fully human, and we are to remain so, we need the perspective and balance provided by participation in the arts.

Notes

1. The following journals were surveyed for the period 1960-1982: Quarterly Journal of Speech; Communication Monographs; Communication Education; Southern Speech Communication Journal; Western Journal of Speech Communication; Central States Speech Journal; and, Communication Quarterly.
2. SCA has recently announced the publication of Performance of Literature in Historical Perspectives, which was prepared under the auspices of the Interpretation Division. Thirty essays by scholars in various fields explore the performance of literature historically from the perspectives of languages and literature, popular culture, academic study, communication theories, and professional entertainment. Speaking in anticipation of this volume's publication, Hopkins and Long (1981) felt it would help promote needed additional historical studies. They said, "The more than 200 year past in the U.S., if more fully described, would substantially enlarge our understanding of performed literature as well as the larger cultural history of our country" (p. 240).
3. See Fine and Speer (1977) for research suggestions on performance in its social and cultural context, including performances, performer-types, and performer enactment.

References

Abel, L., & Post, R. Towards a Poor Readers Theatre. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 1973, LIX, 436-442.

Adler, T. The Dialogue of Incompletion: Language in Tennessee William's Later Plays. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 1975, LXI, 48-58.

Bacon, W. The Dangerous Shores: From Elocution to Interpretation. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 1960, XLVI, 148-152.

Bacon, W. Problems in the Interpretation of Shakespeare. Communication Education, 1973, XXII, 273-281.

Bacon, W. The Dangerous Shores a Decade Later. In R. Haas & D. Williams (Eds.) The Study of Oral Interpretation: Theory and Comment. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1975.

Bacon, W. A Sense of Being: Interpretation in the Humanities. Southern Speech Communication Journal, 1976, 41, 135-141.

Bacon, W. Foreword. In E. Doyle & V. Floyd (Eds.) Studies in Interpretation Vol. II. Amsterdam, Netherlands: Rodopi N.U., 1977.

Bacon, W. Higher Education and Speech Communication: The Next Decade. Southern Speech Communication Journal, 1977, 43, 9-15.

Barclay, M. The Genesis of Modern Oral Interpretation: 1915-1930. Communication Education, 1972, XXI, 39-45.

Becker, S. The Role of Theatre in Our Society: Implications for School Curricula. Communication Education, 1966, XV, 126-131.

Bellow, S. Mr. Sammler's Planet. Greenwich, Connecticut: Fawcett Crest, 1971.

Beloof R. The Oral Reader and the Future of Literary Studies. Communication Education, 1969, XVIII, 9-12.

Benson, T. Rhetoric and Autobiography: The Case of Malcom X. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 1974, LX, 1-13.

Bogusch, G. Clarkson Stanfield, R.A.: Scene Painter, Artist, Gentleman, and Friend. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 1970, LVI, 245-255.

Breneman, B. & Breneman, L. Once Upon a Time. Communication Education, 1965, XIV, 216-223.

Brooks, K & Crane, J. Semantic Agreement in Readers Theatre. Western Journal of Speech Communication, 1974, 38, 124-132.

Brooks, K., Henderhan, R., & Billings, A. A Philosophy on Readers Theatre. Communication Education, XII, 229-232.

Brooks, K., & Wulfetange, Sr. I. M. Listener Response to Oral Interpretation. Communication Monographs, XXXI, 73-79.

Brown, W. A Function of Metaphor in Poetry. Communication Education, 1973, XXII, 32-37.

Browne, R. The Shropshire Lad as Funeral Orator. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 1971, LVII, 134-139.

Campbell, P. Performance: The Pursuit of Folly. Communication Education, 1971, XX, 263-274.

Campbell, P. Response to "The Performing Audience." Southern Speech Communication Journal, 1981, 46, 157-162.

Campbell, P. The Theatre Audience: An Abstraction. Southern Speech Communication Journal, 1981, 46, 139-152.

Campbell, P. The Well-Tempered Audience. Central States Speech Journal, 1981, 32, 35-44.

Clark, L. Theatre as a Liberal Art: a Plea. Central States Speech Journal, 1971, XXII, 27-31.

Coger, L. Interpreter's Theatre: Theatre of the Mind. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 1963, XLIX, 157-164.

Coger, L. Theatre for Oral Interpreters. Communication Education, 1963, XII, 322-330.

Coger, L. & Pelham, S. Kinesics Applies to Interpreters Theatre. Communication Education, XXIV, 91-99.

Cole, W. America's First Revolving Stage. Western Journal of Speech Communication, 1963, 27, 36-39.

Conquergood, D. We Born With It, We Die With It: Laotian Refugees in Chicago. Paper presented at the meeting of SCA, Louisville, Kentucky, November, 1982.

Dolan, N. Audience Response to Use of Offstage Focus and Onstage Focus in Readers Theatre. Communication Monographs, 1971, XXXVIII, 74-77.

Downer, A. Love in Several Masques: Notes on the New York Theatre, 1959-1960. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 1960,

XLVI, 253-261.

Downer, A. Picking Up the Pieces: Notes on the New York Theatre, 1960-1961. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 1961, XLVII, 229-238.

Downer, A. Experience of Heroes: Notes on the New York Theatre, 1961-1962. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 1962, XLVIII, 261-270.

Downer, A. Bushranger and Backwoodsman: Notes on the New York Theatre, 1962-1963. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 1963, XLIX, 250-261.

Downer, A. Shakespeare and Company: Notes on the New York Theatre, 1963-1964. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 1964, L, 240-251.

Downer, A. The New Group: Notes on the New York Theatre, 1964-1965. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 1965, LI, 245-257.

Downer, A. Total Theatre and Partial Drama: Notes on the New York Theatre, 1965-1966. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 1966, LII, 225-236.

Downer, A. The Doctor's Dilemma: Notes on the New York Theatre, 1966-1967. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 1967, LIII, 213-223.

Downer, A. Old, New, Borrowed, and (a Trifle) Blue: Notes on the New York Theatre, 1967-1968. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 1968, LIV, 199-211.

Downer, A. More Strange Than True: Notes on the New York

Theatre, 1968-1969. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 1969, LV, 225-236.

Downey, S. & Kallan, R. Semi-Aesthetic Detachment: The Fusing of Fictional and External Worlds in the Situational Literature and Leon Uris. Communication Monographs, 1982, 49, 192-204.

Elkind, D. The Hurried Child - Growing Up Too Fast Too Soon. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1982.

Elsea, J. Conversation. Journal of Arizona Communication and Theatre Association, 1978 ERIC ED 157 135, 27-31.

Enos, R. The Hellenic Rhapsode. Western Journal of Speech Communication, 1978, 42, 134-143.

Erlich, H. The Congruence of Aristotle's Rhetoric and Poetics. Southern Speech Communication Journal, 1973, 38, 362-370.

Espinola, J. The Nature, Function, and Performance of Indirect Discourse in Prose Fiction. Communication Monographs, 1974, 41, 193-204.

Espinola, J. Oral Interpretation Performance: An Act of Publication. Western Journal of Speech Communication, 1977, 41, 90-97.

Fine, E. & Speer, J. A New Look at Performance. Communication Monographs, 1977, 44, 374-389.

Frandsen, K., Rocky, J., & Kleinau, M. Changes in the Factorial Composition of a Semantic Differential as a

Function of Differences in Readers Theatre Productions. Communication Monographs, 1965, XXXII, 112-118.

Gamble, T. Sex as a Factor Influencing Evaluation and Comprehension of "Male" and "Female" Monologues. Western Journal of Speech Communication, 1977, 41, 110-116.

Geiger, D. Oral Interpretation and the Teaching of Literature. Communication Education, 1962, XI, 202-207.

Geiger, D. Poetic Realizing as Knowing. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 1973, LIX, 311-318.

Geiger, D. Interpretation and the Locus of Poetic Meaning. In R. Haas & D. Williams (Eds.) The Study of Oral Interpretation: Theory and Comment. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1975.

Gillespie, P. Feminist Theatre: A Rhetorical Phenomenon. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 1978, LXIV, 284-294.

Gillespie, P. Theatre as Communication. Southern Speech Communication Journal, 1979, XLIV, 167-175.

Gillespie, P. The Performing Audience. Southern Speech Communication Journal, 1981, 46, 124-138.

Gillespie, P. Response to "The Theatre Audience: An Abstraction." Southern Speech Communication Journal, 1981, 46, 153-156.

Glenn, S. Style and Stanislavski. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 1963, XLIX, 40-45.

Gottlieb, L. The Antibusiness Theme in Late 19th Century American Drama. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 1978, 64, 415-426.

Gray, P. Strange Bedfellows: My Life and Hard Times in a Speech Communication Department. Southern Speech Communication Journal, 1979, 44, 159-166.

Hansen, B. & Bormann, E. A New Look at a Semantic Differential for the Theatre. Communication Monographs, 1969, XXXVI, 163-170.

Hansen, B., Phillips, G., & Arnold, W. Research Note: Measuring the Message Delivered by a Dramatic Production. Communication Monographs, 1965, XXXII, 461-464.

Hargis, D. Interpretation as Oral Communication. Central States Speech Journal, 1960, XI, 168-173.

Hargis, D. The Rhapsode. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 1970, LVI, 388-398.

Harrison, A. C. Negro Actors: The Added Dimensions of Color. Southern Speech Communication Journal, 1969 35, 16-27.

Hartman, B. & Alho, B. Old Age: Tradition Shelved or Shared? Augusta, Maine: Maine Committee on Aging, 1977.

Hartman, B. & Alho, B. As Others See Us (An Original Script Based on the Lives of Six Handicapped People). Augusta, Maine: Maine Council for the Humanities and Public Policy, 1979.

Hartman, B. & Alho, B. The Living Text: The Power of Common Experience in Performance. Short course presented at the meeting of SCA, New York City, November, 1980.

Hellweg, J. & Hellweg, S. The Seagull: A Communicative

Analysis of Chekhovian Drama. Communication Quarterly, 1982, 30, 150-154.

Highet, G. The Classical Tradition. New York, Oxford University Press, 1959.

Hirschfeld-Medalia, A. Stylized Movement in Interpreters Theatre. Communication Education, 1976, XXV, 111-120.

Hobbs, R. Is the Liberal Arts Theatre Obsolete? Communication Education, 1964, XIII, 304-309.

Hopf, T. Reticence and the Oral Interpretation Teacher. Communication Education, 1970, XIX, 268-271.

Hopkins, M. F. Linguistic Analysis as a Tool for the Oral Interpreter. Communication Education, 1969, XVIII, 200-203.

Hopkins, M. F. Russian Poetry into English: Linguistic Analysis and Poetry in Translation. Communication Monographs, 1971, XXXVIII, 56-64.

Hopkins, M. F. Structuralism: Its Implications for the Performance of Prose Fiction. Communication Monographs, 1977, 44, 93-105.

Hopkins, M. F. & Long, B. W. Performance as Knowing and Knowing Performance. Central States Speech Journal, 1981, 32, 236-242.

Hudson, L. Oral Interpretation as Metaphorical Expression. Communication Education, 1973, XXII, 27-31.

Jackson, E. The Emergence of the Anti-Hero in the Contemporary Drama. Central States Speech Journal, 1961,

12, 92-99.

Kaplan, S. & Mohrmann, G. P. Reader, Text, Audience: Oral Interpretation and Cognitive Tuning. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 1977, LXIII, 59-65.

Kauffman, C. Poetic as Argument. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 1981, 67, 407-415.

Kaufman, M. O'Casey's Structural Design in Juno and the Paycock. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 1972, LVIII, 191-198.

Kirk, J. Kenneth Burke's Dramatic Criticism Applied to the Theatre. Southern Speech Communication Journal, 1968, 33, 161-177.

Kleinau, M. & Kleinau, M. Scene Location in Readers Theatre: Static or Dynamic? Communication Education, 1965, XIV, 193-199.

Klinzing, D. A Study of the Personality Differences Between Effective and Ineffective Student Actors. Communication Quarterly, 1973, 21, 47-50.

Klyn, M. Potentials for Research in Oral Interpretation. Western Journal of Speech Communication, 1965, 29, 108-113.

Lazier, G. Toward a Practical Poetic. Communication Education, 1970, XIX, 278-282.

Lazier, G., Sutton-Smith, B. & Zahn, D. A Systematic Analysis of Developmental Differences in Dramatic Improvisational Behavior. Communication Monographs,

1971, XXXVIII, 155-165.

Lazier, G., Zahn, D. & Bellinghiere, J. Empirical Analysis of Dramatic Structure. Communication Monographs, 1974, XLI, 381-390.

Lee, C. The Line as a Rhythmic Unit in the Poetry of Theodore Roethke. Communication Monographs, 1963, XXX, 15-22.

Loney, G. London's Subsidized Theatres. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 1966, LII, 63-69.

Loveland, G. & Michielutte, R. Correlates of Aesthetic Interest. Communication Education, 1973, XXII, 125-132.

Macksoud, S. J. Anyone's How Town: Interpretation as Rhetorical Discipline. Communication Monographs, 1968, XXXV, 70-76.

Macksoud, S. J. & Altman, R. Voices in Opposition: A Burkeian Rhetoric of St. Joan. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 1971, LVII, 140-146.

Maher, M. Internal Rhetorical Analysis and the Interpretation of Drama. Central States Speech Journal, 1975, XXVI, 267-273.

Matherne, B. A Kirkegaardian Study of "Hedda Gabler". Western Journal of Speech Communication, 1978, 42, 258-269.

Mattingly, A. Follow Nature: A Synthesis of 18th Century Views. Communication Monographs, 1964, XXXI, 80-84.

McHughes, J. L. The Posis of Space: Prosodic Structures

in Concrete Poetry. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 1977, LXIII, 168-179.

Merritt, F. Concrete Poetry--VERIVOCOVISUAL. Communication Education, 1969, XVIII, 109-114.

Michielutte, R. Secondary School Students' Perceptions of Actors. Communication Education, 1969, XVIII, 30-38.

Mohrmann, G. P. & Kaplan, S. The Effect of Training on the Oral Interpreter's Perception of a Text. Central States Speech Journal, 1980, 31, 137-142.

Molette, C. Aristotle's Union of Rhetoric and Dramatic Theory. Southern Speech Communication Journal, 1968, 34, 47-54.

Murphy, R. Nonverbal Communication and the Overlooked Action in Pinter's "The Caretaker". Quarterly Journal of Speech, 1972, LVIII, 41-47.

Overstreet, R. John T. Ford and the Savannah Theatre. Southern Speech Communication Journal, 1972, 38, 51-60.

Pelias, R. Empathy: Some Implications of Social Cognition Research for Interpretation Study. Central States Speech Journal, 1982, 33, 519-532.

Phillips, G., Hansen, B., & Carlson, D. A Preliminary Experiment in Measuring Attitude Shifts as a Result of Viewing a Dramatic Production. Communication Monographs, 1965, XXXII, 209-213.

Post, R. Achievement of Emphatic Responses in Oral Reading. Southern Speech Communication Journal, 1963, XXVII, 236-240.

Post, R. Cognitive Dissonance in the Plays of Edward Albee. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 1969, LV, 54-60.

Reitz, M. The Application of Selected Dramatic Theories of Stanislavski as a Solution to Disunity in Readers Theatre. Communication Education, 1966, XV, 191-196.

Reynolds, J. It Wasn't "Elocution": Five Professional Oral Interpreters, 1900-1925. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 1961, XLVII, 244-252.

Riach, W. A. D. "Telling It Like It Is": An Examination of Black Theatre as Rhetoric. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 1970, LVI, 179-186.

Rickert, W. Commercializing Elocution: "Parlor Books" for Home Entertainments. Southern Speech Communication Journal, 1978, 43, 384-394.

Rienstra, P. Resurrecting the Past: Historical Documents as Materials for Readers Theatre. Communication Education, 1972, XXI, 310-314.

Ritchey, D. Baltimore's 18th Century French Theatre. Southern Speech Communication Journal, 1972, 38, 164-172.

Salper, D. Some Rhetorical and Poetic Crossroads in the Interpretation of Literature. Western Journal of Speech Communication, 1973, 37, 264-272.

Schneider, R. The Visible Metaphor. Communication Education, 1976, XXV, 121-126.

Scott, P. Language and Cognitive Processes: Directions for Research in Interpretation, 1977, ERIC ED 192 430, 1-26.

Scully, D. The London Merchant of 1731 Can Die as a Salesman Today: Modern Production for the Period Play. Communication Education, 1966, XV, 152-157.

Sharpham, J., Matter, G., & Brockriede, W. The Interpretative Experience as a Rhetorical Transaction. Central States Speech Journal, 1971, XXII, 143-150.

Sloan, T. Restoration of Rhetoric to Literary Study. Communication Education, 1967, XVI, 91-97.

Sloan, T. Oral Interpretation in the Ages Before Sheridan and Walker. Western Journal of Speech Communication, 1971, 35, 147-154.

Smith, R. A Semantic Differential for Theatre Concepts. Communication Monographs, 1961, XXVIII, 1-8.

Speer, J. Culture Contact Through Literature Performance. Communication Education, 1975, XXIV, 209-210.

Speer, J. Folklore and Interpretation: Symbiosis. Southern Speech Communication Journal, 1975, XL, 365-376.

Speer, J. & Fine, E. Poesis and Performance in Patrick County Virginia. Paper presented at the meeting of SCA, Louisville, Kentucky, November, 1982.

Staub, A. Rhetoric and Poetic: The Rhetoric as Poet--Plot Maker. Southern Speech Communication Journal, 1961, 26, 285-290.

Sturges, C. The Effect of a Narrator's Presence on Audience Response to Character in the Staging of Narrative Literature. Communication Education, 1975, XXIV, 46-52.

Symposium: Empirical and Experimental Studies in Oral

Interpretation. Western Journal of Speech Communication, 1969, 33, 222-282.

Thayer, D. Use of Smith's Semantic Differential for Theatrical Performance Concepts. Communication Monographs, 1964, XXXI, 180-182.

Thompson, D. Teaching the History of Interpretation. Communication Education, 1973, XXI, 38-40.

Thurman, W. Journey into Night: Elements of Tragedy in Eugene O'Neill. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 1966, LII, 139-145.

Valentine, K. B. & Donovan, M. Rationale for Communication Arts in Correctional Institutions. Journal of Arizona Communication and Theatre Association, 1978, ERIC ED 157 135, 2-6.

Veilleux, J. Toward a Theory of Interpretation. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 1969, LV, 105-115

Waal, C. Rhetoric in Action: Orators in the Plays of Henrik Ibsen. Southern Speech Communication Journal, 1971, 37, 249-258.

Walsh, D. Literature and Knowledge. Middleton, Connecticut: Wesleyan University Press, 1969.

Warland, S., Trauernicht, M., & Gruner, C. Audience Response to Visual Stimuli in Oral Interpretation. Southern Speech Communication Journal, 1967, 32, 289-295.

Whitaker, B. Research Directions in the Performance of Literature. Communication Monographs, 1973, XL, 238-242.

Williams, D. & Alexander, D. Effects of Audience Responses on the Performance of Oral Interpretation. Western Journal of Speech Communication, 1973, 37, 273-280.

Wilson, M. G. Charles Kean: Tragedian in Transition. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 1974, LX, 45-57.

Witt, D. Audience Responses to Acting, Readers Theatre and Silent Reading of Realistic and Anti-Realistic Drama. Western Journal of Speech Communication, 1966, 30, 123-129.

Woodbury, L. Death on the Romantic Stage. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 1963, XLIX, 57-61.

Zortman, B. The Theatre of Ideology in Nazi Germany. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 1971, LVII, 153-162.